

REMARKS**35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections**

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for the reasons of record stated on page 2 of the Office Action. Claim 17 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Support for this amendment is found on page 13 of the instant application. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn and this claim allowed.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 17 - 21 and 24 - 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over WO 97/16263 published in the name of Hansmann for the reasons of record stated on pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action. To support the rejection, the Office Action cites two examples in Hansmann, both of which purport to include nonionic surfactant. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Hansmann does not teach or suggest *inter alia* utilizing a nonionic surfactant system wherein said nonionic surfactant system comprises at least one nonionic surfactant having a cloud point greater than 60°C and at least one nonionic surfactant having a cloud point less than 10°C. Furthermore, there is nothing in Hansmann which teaches or suggests utilizing compositions that have an interfacial tension of from about 10 mNm⁻¹ to about 0.0001 mNm⁻¹. With regard to Claims 24 - 29, the Office Action indicates that the claimed additional components are optional components only. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants are not certain what the Office Action is referring to with regard to "additional components". Clarification is requested. Furthermore, claims 24 - 29 do not include "optional" components.

Hence, as Claims 17 - 21 and 24 - 34 are not anticipated by Hansmann, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 17 - 21 and 24 - 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over GB 2,204,321 published in the name of Chavannes for the reasons of record stated on page 4 of the Office Action. To support the rejection, the Office Action cites an example in Chavannes which purportedly includes a cleaning fluid comprising water, two nonionic surfactants, sodium nitrilotriacetate, and an alkyl benzene sulfonate. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Chavannes does not teach or suggest *inter alia* utilizing a nonionic surfactant system wherein said nonionic surfactant system comprises at least one nonionic surfactant having a cloud point greater than 60°C and at least one nonionic surfactant having a cloud point less than 10°C. Furthermore, there is nothing in Chavannes which teaches or suggests utilizing compositions that have an interfacial tension of from about 10 mNm⁻¹ to about 0.0001 mNm⁻¹. With regard to Claims 24 - 29, the Office Action indicates that the claimed additional components are optional components only. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants are not certain what the Office Action is referring to with regard to "additional components". Clarification is requested. Furthermore, claims 24 - 29 do not include "optional" components.

Hence, as Claims 17 - 21 and 24 - 34 are not anticipated by Chavannes, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 17 - 21 and 24 - 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,529,788 issued to DeSenna for the reasons of record stated on pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. DeSenna purports to disclose utilizing a water soluble effervescent table containing surfactant and enzymes for addition to a cleaning solution. Claims 17 - 21 and 24 - 34 of the instant application are not anticipated by DeSenna as the claims of the instant invention require *inter alia* a low foaming composition. As the composition of DeSenna is effervescent it is high foaming. Hence, Claims 17 - 21 and 24 - 34 are not anticipated by DeSenna. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 17 - 21 and 24 - 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. 4,448,750 issued to Fuesting for the reasons of record stated on page 5 of the Office Action. The Office Action indicates that Fuesting teaches a sterilizing liquid comprising water, an alkyl sulfate, and carbamide. To support this assertion, the Office Action cites column 10, Claim 11 of Fuesting. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and point out that Claim 11 of Fuesting purports to disclose a liquid solution of sodium dodecyl sulfate and carbamide. Fuesting does not teach or suggest *inter alia* utilizing alkyl sulfate. Hence, Claims 17 - 21 and 24 - 34 are not anticipated by Fuesting. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 17 - 21 and 24 - 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. 4,308,229 issued to Voit for the reasons of record stated on pages 5 and 6 of the Office Action. The Office Action indicates that Voit teaches a sterilizing liquid comprising benzethonium chloride, ethoxylated alcohol, and isopropanol. Voit does not teach or suggest utilizing *inter alia* Applicants claimed surfactants. Hence, Voit does not anticipate Claims 17 - 21 or Claims 24 - 34 of the instant application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 17 - 21 and 24 - 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,464,477 issued to Awad for the reasons of record stated on page 6 of the Office Action. The Office Action indicates that Awad teaches an ultrasonically agitated cleaning solution. To support this assertion, the Office Action cites two examples in Awad including one example of an anionic surfactant, citric acid, and ammonium citrate and a second example of two nonionic surfactants and sodium carbonate. Awad does not teach *inter alia* the specific anionic surfactant or nonionic surfactant system as claimed by Applicants. Furthermore, Awad does not teach or suggest a low foaming cleaning composition having an inter facial tension as claimed by Applicants. Hence, Claims 17 - 21 and 24 - 34 of the instant application are not anticipated by Awad. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 17 - 21 and 24 - 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,770,550 issued to Motson for the reasons of record stated on page 6 of the Office Action. The Office Action indicates that Motson teaches a method for cleaning hard surfaces and cites as an example of a composition used for this purpose an alky ether carboxylate, trisodium phosphate, EDTA, sodium metasilicate, and water. Motson does not teach *inter alia* the specific nonionic surfactant system as claimed by Applicants. Furthermore, Motson does not teach or suggest a cleaning composition having an inter facial tension as claimed by Applicants. Yet further, Motson

does not teach or suggest a composition that is low foaming. Hence, Claims 17 - 21 and 24 - 34 of the instant application are not anticipated by Motson. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 17 - 22 and 24 - 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,372,741 issued to Tomaszewski for the reasons of record stated on page 7 of the Office Action. The Office Action indicates that Tomaszewski teaches a process for cleaning workpiece surfaces by using ultrasound and a cleaning fluid. The Office Action cites as an example to support this assertion a cleaning fluid of water, ethoxylated alcohol nonionic surfactant, phosphate ester anionic surfactant, alkyl imidazolium amphoteric surfactant, and potassium carbonate. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Tomaszewski does not teach *inter alia* the specific surfactants as claimed by Applicants. Furthermore, Tomaszewski does not teach or suggest a cleaning composition having an inter facial tension as claimed by Applicants. Yet further, Tomaszewski does not teach or suggest a low foaming composition which is substantially free of defoaming agents. Hence, Claims 17 - 21 and 24 - 34 of the instant application are not anticipated by Tomaszewski. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 17 - 21 and 24 - 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,350,457 issued to Kitazawa et al. for the reasons of record stated on page 7 of the Office Action. The Office Action indicates that Kitazawa teaches a process for cleaning workpiece surfaces utilizing ultrasound and a cleaning fluid. The Office Action cites as an example to support this assertion a cleaning fluid comprising water, an ethoxylated alcohol and ethylene oxide/propylene oxide copolymer, and an alkyl benzene sulfonate. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Kitazawa does not teach or suggest *inter alia* utilizing a nonionic surfactant system wherein said nonionic surfactant system comprises at least one nonionic surfactant having a cloud point greater than 60°C and at least one nonionic surfactant having a cloud point less than 10°C. Furthermore, there is nothing in Kitazawa which teaches or suggests utilizing compositions that have an inter facial tension of from about 10 mNm⁻¹ to about 0.0001 mNm⁻¹. Yet further, Kitazawa does not teach or suggest a low foaming composition which is substantially free of defoaming agents. Hence, Claims 17 - 21 and 24 - 34 of the instant application are not anticipated by Kitazawa. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

As the present invention is neither anticipated by nor obvious in light of the above references, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 be reconsidered and withdrawn and the claims allowed.

SUMMARY

This is responsive to the Office Action dated April 30, 2004. Applicants hereby petition for a two-month extension of time to respond to this Action. Please charge any fees associated with this response to Deposit Account No.: 16-2480. As the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 and §102 have been overcome, Applicants respectfully request these rejections be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Respectfully submitted,
FOR: JEAN-FRANCOIS ET AL.;

BY: 

Julia A. Glazer
(Attorney for Applicants)
Registration No. 41,783
(513) 627-4132

August 31, 2004
Cincinnati, Ohio